DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 597 CS 500 799

AUTHOR Surlin, Stuart H.; Gordon, Thomas F.
TITLE Selective Exposure and Retention of Political Advertising: A Regional Comparison.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (New Orleans, April 17-20, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Mass Media; *Media Research; Political Attitudes; *Politics; *Publicize; Retention; *Surveys; Television; *Urban Areas

ABSTRACT

The results presented in this article are but a portion of the information gathered in a larger survey examining the relative roles of "selective exposure" to and "selective retention" of political advertising during the 1972 presidential election. Random samples in two metropolitan areas in different regions of the country (Atlanta, Ga., n=281; and Philadelphia, Pa., n=279) were surveyed by phone to test specific hypotheses. Several regional inter-city differences were noted: Philadelphians indicated greater general exposure to mass media political advertising, while Atlantans were more inclined to recall specific advertisements; respondents in both cities were highly likely to say that they were exposed to political advertising on television; and three of every four first recalled advertisements were seen on television. It was concluded that a negative correlation exists between a medium's propensity for exposure and the individual's selective retention of political information presented through that medium, and that a medium rated high for exposure mentions will be rated low on selective retention mentions, and vice versa. (RB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 095597

Selective Exposure and Retention of Political Advertising: A Regional Comparison

by
Stuart H. Surlin
School of Journalism
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
and
Thomas F. Gordon
Radio-Television-Film Department
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Stuart H. Surlin
Thomas F. Gordon
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

International Communication Association Convention
April, 1974 New Orleans, La.
Political Communication Division

CS 500 799

Introduction

This research examines the relative roles of selective exposure to and selective retention of political advertising during the 1972 presidential election. The findings stem from a telephone survey of two major urban areas, Atlanta, Ga. and Philadelphia, Pa. (N=560). The results presented in this article are but a portion of the information gathered in that larger survey. Given this concentrated look at these two specific variables, the present article will present a detailed review of past research for comparative purposes.

Selective Exposure

Selective exposure to mass media content has been a continuing area of interest for researchers. The concept "selective exposure" refers to the systematic bias in audience composition. The most persistent problem in research in this conceptual area has been distinguishing between incidental exposure as opposed to self-controlled, pre-meditated selective exposure. A parallel problem involves the "reasons-why" selectivity occurs and the time-order relationship of exposure, reasons-why, and pre-meditated behavior.

Sears and Freedman (1967), in an extensive search and analysis of the literature dealing with selective exposure, did not find over-whelming support for the selective exposure principle, especially when "'Selectivity' described audience bias in the direction of agreeing to an unusual extent with the communicator's stand on an issue relevant to the communication."[1] They suggest that the relationship between certain types of message receivers and the messages to which they are exposed may be spurious and not a result of concious selection on the part of the receiver. They conclude:

"Thus many reports of 'de facto' selective exposure may represent little more than cases in which highly educated persons, who normally are overrepresented in any audience for public affairs presentations, also share a common set of political, social, and/or economic attitudes. . . .So, on several grounds, published reports of 'de facto' selectivity fall somewhat short of representing ideal proof that people do in fact 'tend to expose themselves to those mass communications which are in accord with their existing attitudes.' Often it has not been established that these attitudes actually did exist beforehand, and often it is not entirely clear what the pattern of exposure actually was."[2]

Several other authors have recently summarized selective exposure findings as they relate to political thought and behavior (Weiss, 1969; McCombs, 1972). They arrived at the same conclusion as Sears and Freedman. Weiss (1969), after reviewing both British and American research concerning selective exposure to political content in various mass media concludes:

"Even without the essentially negative British results, the data from the American studies do not support a strong form of the selective-exposure hypothesis. Political partisianship and predispositions are associated with imbalanced exposure to party propaganda, but the degree of such partiality is not overly strong. . . Though selective exposure has been construed as an active screening-out and seeking-out of people, in order to avoid contrary information and to obtain reinforcement for their views, there may also be selective exposure without motivated intent."[3]

McCombs (1972) describes how the concepts of selective exposure and selective perception are subsumed under the theory of cognitive dissonance, the "reason-why" of selective mass media behavior. Since dissonance is psychologically uncomfortable, the existence of much dissonance motivates the individual to reduce it. Therefore, one would be motivated to avoid threatening, nonconcurring messages and seek out non-threatening, concurring messages. McCombs concludes, however, "Selective exposure and selective perception have been the Achilles heel of dissonance theory. . ....predictions of selective exposure and selective preception, especially avoidance of nonsupportive messages, frequently have not been borne out by the empirical studies."[4]

In summary, one may conclude that the concept of selective exposure has not proven to be a useful variable by predicting mass media behavior, expecially as related to exposure to political content.

This absence of selective exposure in media behavior is believed to be applicable to political advertising as well. Shaw and Bowers (1973) found that individuals who reported high use of television for political news were much more likely to report seeing a commercial for Nixon and/or McGoverr in the 1972 presidential campaign. They conclude, "Apparently exposure to television is related to exposure to commercials, perhaps for many a case of 'incidental' exposure."[5] This is a clear-cut finding supporting 'de facto' exposure.

In another study, Sheinkopf et. al. (1973) examined the degree to which respondents said they made a conscious effort to avoid political advertising. In relation to advertising used in the 1972 presidential campaign, Sheinkopf says of his findings: "Few persons said they made any conscious effort to avoid political advertising from either party. Nixon supporters were slightly more inclined to ignore McGovern advertising, and a number of supporters for both candidates ignored their own candidates' advertising."[6] Again, a finding not consistent with the concept of selective exposure.

Findings by Atkin (1971) and Atkin, et. al. (1972) are inconsistent when considering either an editorial or advertising context, availability of political-oriented material, and exposure. When dealing with news items Atkin concludes:

"...the relative availability of news items about two candidates has a clear effect on the exposure preferences of individuals with no pre-existing opinions; ...For messages that are supportive or discrepant of a partisan individual's predispositions, the level of availability seems to have a much weaker influence. ...Possibly the desire to read supportive information leads partisan readers to seek out news stories about their side, even when these articles are given less favorable coverage than stories dealing with the opposing viewpoint."[7]

However, in a study dealing with exposure to political advertising in two gubernatorial campaigns, Atkin, et. al. find:

"The amount of daily television viewing time was the primary determinant of noticing political ads; among light viewers who watched TV less than one hour per day, almost half did not recall both candidates' ads. ...The relative availability factor seems to overcome partisan selectivity at this primitive level of message reception."[8]

Likewise, Atkin, et.al.,, found little avoidance of political advertising by television viewers. When interpreting avoidance behavior they conclude that, "Most avoiders were motivated less by partisan considerations than by boredom with a candidate's advertising campaign or antagonism toward political ads in general."[9] Likewise half of the respondents admitted that they watched ads for each candidate because they "can't avoid them."

Recent models designed to depict time-lagged relationships between "availability" variables and politically-oriented mass media content exposure patterns have been somewhat conflicting. McCombs and Mullins (1973) find that "education" (a variable relating to availability) precedes, and significantly affects, mass media exposure which affects political interest.[10] On the other hand, Johnson (1973) has developed a model which:

> "...makes politicization a developmental process which leads from family politicization to political interest, to media usage, to political information. ...Since there is no relationship between television availability and political interest, this appears to be independent of the process involving political interest, mass media usage and political information."[11]

The discrepencies uncovered in the models of political mass media behavior as well as in political news items and advertising may point up an area for future concentrated research. An important difference may be the way availability of mass media vehicles (and/or demographic or sociopsychological variables which affect availability), affect exposure to media politically-oriented news content as opposed to advertising.

Regardless, the evidence to date rejects the existence of a selective exposure process, especially in the area of political advertising. On the other hand, the evidence suggests that human variables which correlate with high mass media behavior are more likely to be predictive of high "de facto" or "incidental" exposure to political information content, especially political advertising.

Selective Retention

A concept independently following from exposure to mass media messages, whether one has been selectively exposed or not, is selective retention. Once an individual is exposed to a message he will, to some degree, recall or forget some of the material. However, if selective retention is operating, one will more readily recall political information congruent with his voting preference and predisposition and forget information which is incongruent.

Unfortunately, not many mass communication researchers assess this concept. Most studies move from exposure levels to attitude or affective measures without measuring the intervening variable of "information retained" from the message. Infering total recall from exposure to a politically-oriented message is inconsistent with even the limited findings in this area of study.

For example, Carter (1962) found that respondents who claimed to have been interested in and attentive to the first Kennedy-Nixon debate remembered both candidates arguments equally well; however, among the less interested and attentive, correct recall was higher for the arguments of their own candidate than of the other.[12] This research has not been replicated within an advertising context, however.

Mass Media Behavior Patterns and Political Information

One must consider the vehicles of mass communication when studying the concepts of selective exposure and retention. As stated earlier in this paper, general mass media exposure patterns seem to be more predictive of exposure to political information than is the concept of selective exposure. This leads to the next logical question: What types of individuals are exposed to which media when receiving political information? Following from this: which media are most often used as bases for the selective retention of political information in advertisements?

Without a doubt, television is the medium most often cited as one's main source of information concerning politics. In a recent nationwide Roper survey, respondents were asked: "Which of these media give you the clearest understanding of candidates and issues in national elections?" In ranked order the responses were: Television (59%), Newspaper (21%), Magazines (8%), and Radio (3%), none or don't know (9%).[13] Likewise, Wade and Schramm (1969) note that all demographic groups do make substantial use of TV during presidential campaigns. They also find that education, income, and occupation do discriminate between, and positively correlate with, the heavy and light users of print and broadcast media for political news and information.[14]

Prisuta (1973) has attempted to deal with the question of which medium is most "important" in disseminating political information. He finds that, "...the more an individual is exposed to political information via the mass media, especially newspapers, the more likely he is to vote, be interested in the political system, and know more about it."[15] He has difficulty resolving the meaning of media "importance", however, after discovering the extensive use people make of television for political information. He states:

> "While newspapers display the strongest relationship, broadcasting, particularly television, displays the widest reach. More people are highly exposed to television than any other medium by a wide margin. It is this reach-versus-effectiveness paradox that makes it difficult to label one particular medium as the most important."[16]

There is validation for the conclusion that newspapers are more strongly related with political involvement than is television. McCombs (1968) concludes,

> "As awareness of politics develops, television most likely is the medium turned to first because it already is available. Using a TV set for political information is qualitatively a far different and simpler act than purchasing and reading a newspaper. As the appetite for political information increases, it is likely that the newspaper is added as a second source of information."[17]

Further validation can be inferred from the findings by Trenaman and McQuail (1961). They found that people were more likely to watch a political broadcast by an opposing party than to read a newspaper whose editorial policy opposed

their political allegiance.[18] Clearly, a lower degree of political involvement occurs when obtaining political information from television as compared to political information obtained from newspaper exposure. An individual, therefore, feels a greater degree of dissonance when confronted with a newspaper advocating an opposing candidate than when confornted with a similar television message.

Sheinkopf (1973) collected data which compares mass media news content and advertising as the sources from which individuals received most of their information relating to political issues of the 1972 presidential election. For the first issue named by respondents, television news was cited by 56% as their main source of information, newspaper stories were named by 30%, television advertising 5%, radio news 3.5%, and 5.5% spread among other sources. This general response pattern held for the second issue recalled by respondents. These findings clearly indicate the use made of television, as well as the greater use made of news content as opposed to advertising content.

One concludes from the survey of literature that, high education, income, and occupation individuals are more apt to be exposed to political information because of their generally higher mass media behavior, especially the use of television newspaper. Also, newspapers are more psychologically involving when dealing with political information. In general, the news content of the mass media is recalled as being more politically informative than is mass media advertising. However, no one has specifically considered the relative degree of information retained from either medium within the advertising context. Is information from advertising in different media differentially and selectively retained? The answer to this question would help answer the question of which medium is most "important" within the advertising context.

Hypotheses

Based on the previous research concerning exposure to political information, the following were hypothesized:

H_1: More individuals will be exposed to political advertising on television than any other medium.

H_2: High education and socio-economic status groups will be more exposed to political advertising than will low education and socio-economic status groups.

Similarily, a relationship should exist between exposure and recall, therefore:

H_3: Higher education and socio-economic status groups will be more likely to specifically recall a political advertising message than lower education and socio-economic status groups.

Since an individual should be less able to avoid advertising in the more widely used media, such as television, thus increasing his incidental exposure, the relationship of exposure and selective retention should be as follows:

H_4: The less the exposure to a particular medium for political advertising, the greater the selective retention of information from that medium.

In terms of selective retention, since the greatest amount of exposure is likely to be incidental (inferring low involvement of message receiver), for individuals specifically recalling political advertising it is hypothesized that:

H_5: Information relating to the preferred candidate will be selectively retained to a greater degree than information relating to the opposing candidates.

Methodology

To test the above hypotheses, systematic random samples were drawn from the 1972 metropolitan phone directories for Atlanta, Georgia (N=670) and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (N=700). Trained interviewers made calls between the dates of October 25th and November 1, 1972.

The results of the calls for each city are as follows:

	Atlanta	Philadelphia
Completed	281	279
Not in service	48	67
No answer	214	219
Refusal	127	139

In Atlanta, of the 408 contacts made, the completion rate was 69%. In Philadelphia, of the 414 contacts made, the completion rate was 67%. The percentage of males and females in the Atlanta sample was 45% male, 55% female: in Philadelphia, 34% male, 66% female. Racially, 85% of the Atlanta sample was white and 14% black, while 73% of the Philadelphia sample was white and 26% black. Racially, the 1970 census indicated that Atlanta metropolitan area was 22% black while the Philadelphia metropolitan area was 33% black.

Respondents were initially asked if they had "...seen any advertising for McGovern or Nixon." If answering yes, they were then asked if they had seen advertising for McGovern and/or Nixon in either television, newspapers, magazines, radio, personal mail, posters, or other media. Each medium was mentioned to the respondent so that he would offer a yes or no reply for each, indicating the candidate the advertising was for. Next, respondents were asked, "Can you specifically remember any of these advertisements?". If they answered in the affirmative they were then asked to specify for which candidate, and to indicate the medium and the basic characteristics of each ad recalled.

Respondents also responded to questions tapping their age, occupation (socio-economic status based on occupation rankings,U.S. census scale), education, and candidate preference. Analyses of exposure and retention were based upon demographic groupings, candidate preference, and city of interview. Chi-square statistics were used to examine group differences and Kendall's Tau was used for rank-order comparisons of media on the basis of exposure and retention.

Results

Exposure to Political Advertisements

For all respondents, only 7% in Atlanta and 9% in Philadelphia stated that they had not seen any political advertisements. As shown in Table #1, of those people who had seen political advertisements television was cited most often as the medium--97% in Atlanta and 98% in Philadelphia. Newspapers and radio, respectively, were named by respondents in both cities as the next most frequent source of political advertising.

-- Table #1 about here --

Relative to the total amount of advertising to which an individual in each city had been exposed, no differences appeared. Philadelphians were more "totally exposed" to mass media political advertising than were Atlantans. However, irrespective of these inter-city exposure levels, the relative degree of exposure to each medium was similar for both cities.

Since television was, by far, the source of political advertising for most people, the first hypothesis which states that: more individuals will be exposed to political advertising on television than any other medium, is confirmed.

When looking at the demographic groupings for individuals exposed to political advertising as presented in Table #2, a significant trend is evident. Consistently, the more the education and higher the socio-economic status of an individual, the greater the exposure to political advertising. The consistency of this finding for both cities gives added strength to the acceptance of the second hypothesis which states: high education and socio-economic status groups will be more exposed to political advertising than will low education and socio-economic status groups.

-- Table #2 about here --

Male-female responses show no significiant differences in either city. Differential exposure by age is more evident in Philadelphia ($p < .005$) than in Atlanta, while race provides a stronger differentiation in exposure in Atlanta ($p < .001$) than in Philadelphia.

Retention of Political Advertisements

A strong consistent difference is found when examining specific retention of the political advertising to which one has been exposed. Here, the more educated and higher socio-economic statused individuals in both cities, were more likely to respond affirmatively than were lower educated and socio-economic statused individuals. This finding gives strong support for the third hypothesis which states: higher education and socio-economic status groups will be more likely to specifically recall a political advertising message than will lower education and socio-economic status groups.

-- Table #3 about here --

When looking at other demographic groupings in Table #3, differences are noted. No male-female differences are evident for either city. In both cities, the younger and the White respondents were more likely to recall a political ad than were older or Black respondents.

Another interesting finding is that the respondents in Atlanta were significantly more likely to specifically recall a political advertisement than were the respondents in Philadelphia ($X^2=6.42$, $df=1$, $p<.001$). This is interesting in light of the fact that Philadelphians exhibited greater exposure to mass media political advertising than did Atlantans.

An individual was considered to be selectively retentive of political advertising if he only retained information about his preferred candidate when recalling his exposure to advertising within each mass medium. Table #4 lists

the percentage of advertising recalled for only one's preferred candidate within each medium. For McGovern supporters, advertisements received in the mail, seen

-- Table #4 about here --

on posters, or in magazines were more likely to be retained. For Nixon supporters advertisements received in the mail, posters, and other media were the most selectively retained.

It must be noted here that mail advertisements can, in fact, be individualized so that one's retention of information received through mail advertising may be a function of not receiving information from a non-preferred candidate. In relation to this possibility, a recent article about campaign spending stated:

"Because it was not included in the new media spending limitations, heavier use of direct mail was obvious on both sides, and for the Democrats it was an historic campaign" [19]

Selective retention of political advertising information about one's preferred candidate is at a low level for most of the media. However, there is a consistent rank-ordering of media for both candidates in terms of which sources of information are selectively retained.

When Kentall's Tau is used to analyze the rank-ordering of media comparing its ranking on total exposure mentions and selective retention mentions several negative correlations are noted. When the ranking of the media on exposure for Atlantans is compared to selective retention ratings for McGovern supporters, Tau=-.71 ($Z=2.25$, $p<.05$). In other words, a moderately strong negative relationship exists, in that the higher the medium's rank on exposure mentions the lower its rank on selective retention. A lesser negative correlation exists for the ranking of the media on exposure and selective retention when looking at the Philadelphia exposure mentions for McGovern supporters, Tau=-.33 ($Z=0.90$,ns).

When the selective retention rankings for Nixon supporters are compared to the exposure rankings in each city, low to moderate negative correlations are also detected. Compared to media exposure ranks in Atlanta, Tau=-.52 ($Z=1.95$, ns),

and for Philadelphia exposure ranks, Tau=-.33 (Z=1.35, ns).

Although not exhibiting a strong negative correlation between exposure rankings and selective retention rankings, the findings are consistent enough to confirm the fourth hypothesis which states: the less the exposure to a particular medium for political advertising, the greater the selective retention of information from that medium.

When respondents were asked to specifically recall the political advertisements to which they had been exposed, differences in retention were noticed along selective lines. To a significantly greater degree, the McGovern supporters were more apt to recall a McGovern advertisement ($p < .001$), while Nixon supporters

-- Table #5 about here --

were more likely to recall a Nixon advertisement ($p < .001$). As suspected, television was found to be the medium within which a vast majority of the specifically recalled advertising was seen (76% of all first advertisements recalled were from television). Thus, the fifth hypothesis is confirmed which states: information relating to the preferred candidate will be selectively retained to a greater degree than information relating to the opposing candidate. Likewise, the data support the contention that overall television exposure results in a great deal of incidental exposure to political advertising. Since this exposure is incidental, one's psychological involvement with this type of political information is at a very low level and as a result retention is also low. Thus, under these conditions the concept of selective retention becomes highly operative.

Conclusions

This study attempted to examine the concepts of selective exposure and selective retention of political advertising via the mass media. Random samples in two metropolitan areas in different regions of the country (Atlanta, Ga., n=281;

and Philadelphia, Pa., n=279) were surveyed by phone to test specific hypotheses. The results were highly consistent with past findings and new areas of inquiry were probed.

Several regional inter-city differences were noted. Philadelphian's indicated greater general exposure to mass media political advertising while Atlantan's were more apt to recall specific advertisements. However, respondents in both cities were highly likely to say that they were exposed to political advertising on television. Likewise, three of every four first recalled advertisements were seen on television.

This may indicate a case of "overkill" on the part of political advertisers. When urban dwellers are constantly bombarded with mass media political information they may develop an immunity to it and purposely block the messages from their minds. Obviously the Philadelphians were not pushing recall of the exposure out of their consciousness but they were less likely than Atlantans to retain information about a specific advertisement.

All evidence points to incidental or de facto exposure to political advertising on the part of most respondents. Thus, the high television viewer and general media user is more likely to be exposed to political advertising. However, because this type of incidental exposure is not self motivated, the principle of selective retention becomes highly operative. As such, individuals are more likely to retain information about their preferred candidate.

Finally, a negative correlation exists between a medium's propensity for exposure and the individual's selective retention of political information presented within that medium. As such, a medium rated high for exposure mentions will be rated low on selective retention mentions, and vice versa. This is a previously unexplored area of research. However, it does indicate the possibility of "overkill" on a per-medium basis. In other words, as an individual is constantly exposed to political advertising which he is not seeking-out within a medium,

the greater his tendency to resist retaining any political information from this medium. However, if a medium does not inundate the user with not-sought-out political advertising, any advertising which does appear has a greater chance of being selectively retained for one's candidate. In this situation the mass media user may actively seek out his own candidate's message. Selective exposure and retention may both be operative because of a greater psychological involvement with this type of medium. Psychological involvement may be higher because of the more personalized aspect of this type of communication, such as mail advertising, posters, magazines, and radio.

In the past, the more psychologically-involving and personalized media also tended to be least used for the dissemination of political advertising. Experimental research is needed at this point to separate these effects relative to selective exposure and retention.

The point should be made here that many of the televised spot advertisements used by political candidates were used less for information purposes than for image-building purposes.[20] Thus, one could argue that a viewer's affective, rather than cognitive, reaction to a television advertisement is of most importance. However, in response to this point, the question to be answered is still: what information is retained from the political television advertisement and used as the basis for the candidate's perceived image? Do viewers selectively retain one or several aspects of the advertisement in order to rally around or to be critical? Also, does selective retention affect the number of advertisements needed by which a candidate can reinforce or change his image? These questions should be researched.

These findings should assist decision-makers who use mass media political advertising in deciding which medium is most "important". The most important medium seems to differ depending upon the target audience with which one is

attempting to communicate. If the target audience consists of the high television viewing groups, and they favor your candidate, then television spots will lead to increased retention of information concerning your candidate. If it is a low mass media user group, and they favor your candidate, then strategically placed posters, mail, radio, and magazine advertising appear to be a better approach to reach this particular group.

If the target audience is not initially in favor of your candidate then there is a possibility that this audience will not be effectively reached by your message via mass media political advertising. Mass media political advertising seems particularly well suited for reinforcing beliefs, however. The advertiser seems to be in a bind concerning his communication with a "non-believer" because of the principle of selective retention actively at work when incidentally exposed to a high exposure medium such as television; and, possible selective exposure and retention of advertising in high psychologically involving media. Therefore, means of communication other than mass media political advertising seems to be needed for conversion.

Footnotes

[1]David Sears and Jonathan Freedman. "Selective Exposure to Information: A Critical Review," PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 1967, Vol. 31, pp. 194-213 at p. 196.

[2]Ibid., p. 202.

[3]Walter Weiss, "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication," in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, eds., HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 2d ed., Vol. 5, Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1969, pp. 155-177, at p. 159.

[4]Maxwell McCombs, "Mass Communication in Political Campaigns: Information, Gratification, and Persuasion," in F.G. Kline and P.J. Tichenor, eds., CURRENT PERSPECTIVES IN MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH, Beverly Hills, Ca., Sage Publications, 1972, pp. 169-194, at p. 175.

[5]Donald Shaw and Thomas Bowers. "Learning from Commercials: The Influence of TV Advertising on the Voter Political 'Agenda'," paper presented to the Mass Communications and Society Division, Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Ft. Collins, Colo., August, 1973, at p. 6.

[6]Kenneth Sheinkopf, M. Timothy O'Keefe, and Milas Meeske. "Issues Vs. Images in the 1972 Presidential Campaign Strategies," paper presented to the Advertising Division, Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Ft. Collins, Colo., August, 1973.

[7]Charles Atkin, "How Imbalanced Campaign Coverage Affects Audience Exposure Patterns," JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 1971, Vol. 48:2, pp. 235-244, at p. 244.

[8]Charles Atkin, et.al., "Patterns of Voter Reception and Response to Televised Political Advertising in Two Gubernatorial Campaigns," paper presented to the Theory and Methodology Division, Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Carbondale, Ill., August, 1972, at p. 6.

[9]Ibid., p. 9.

[10]Maxwell McCombs and L.E. Mullins, "Consequences of Education: Media Exposure, Political Interest and Information-Seeking Orientations," MASS COMMUNICATION REVIEW, 1973, Vol. 1:1, pp. 27-31.

[11]Norris Johnson, "Television and Politicization: A Test of Competing Models," JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press, 1962, pp. 253-270.

[12]R. F. Carter, "Some Effects of the Debates," in S. Kraus, ed., THE GREAT DEBATES, Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press, 1962, pp. 253-270.

[13]Robert Bower, TELEVISION AND THE PUBLIC, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973, at p. 14.

[14]S. Wade and W. Schramm, "The Mass Media as Sources of Public Affairs, Science, and Health Knowledge," PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 1969, Vol. 33, pp. 197-209.

Footnotes (Con't.)

[15]Robert Prisuta, "Mass Media Exposure and Political Behavior," EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING REVIEW, 7:3, 1973, Vol. 7:3, pp. 167-173, at. p. 172.

[16]Ibid., p. 173.

[17]Maxwell McCombs, "Negro Use of Television and Newspapers for Political Information, 1952-1964", JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, 1968, Vol. 12:3, pp. 261-266, at p. 264.

[18]J. Trenaman and D. McQuail, TELEVISION AND THE POLITICAL IMAGE, London, Methuen, 1961.

[19]Don Grant, "Effective Advertising Let Nixon Keep Low Profile in Campaign," ADVERTISING AGE, Nov. 13, 1972, Vol. 43:46, p. 3+, at p. 109.

[20]Cf. Dan Nimmo, THE POLITICAL PERSUADERS, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1970; Joe McGinniss, THE SELLING OF THE PRESIDENT 1968, New York, Trident Press, 1969; Gene Wyckoff, THE IMAGE CANDIDATES, New York, Macmillan, 1968; Robert MacNeil, THE PEOPLE MACHINE, New York, Harper and Row, 1968.

Table #1

Percentage Exposed to Political Advertising in Seven Media Within Atlanta and Philadelphia

	Atlanta (N=281)	Philadelphia (N=276)
Exposed to Political Advertising	93%	91%
Seen on Television	97%	98%
Seen in Newspapers	58%	89%
Heard on Radio	53%	85%
Seen in Posters	46%	67%
Seen in Other Media	37%	23%
Seen in Magazines	35%	60%
Received in Mail	25%	71%

Table #2

Between Demographic Group Differences for Exposure to Political Advertising Within Atlanta and Philadelphia
(Chi-Square Analysis and Percent Affirming Exposure)

	Within Atlanta (N=281)		Within Philadelphia (N=276)	
Education	$p < .001$		$p < .001$	
8th grade or less	(n=29)	79%	(n=28)	93%
Some H.S.	(n=34)	85%	(n=67)	79%
Completed H.S.	(n=62)	95%	(n=86)	94%
Some College	(n=65)	98%	(n=50)	98%
Completed College	(n=84)	98%	(n=43)	100%
Socio-Economic Status	$p < .01$		$p < .005$	
High - 90+ on U.S. Gov't. Census Scale	(n=69)	99%	(n=25)	100%
Medium - 70-89	(n=109)	94%	(n=71)	100%
Low - 69 or less	(n=103)	87%	(n=178)	87%
Sex	ns		ns	
Male	(n=126)	94%	(n=93)	87%
Female	(n=155)	92%	(n=183)	93%
Age	ns		$p < .005$	
51+ yrs.	(n=66)	88%	(n=97)	84%
31-50 yrs.	(n=110)	95%	(n=96)	97%
30 or less yrs.	(n=104)	95%	(n=83)	93%
Race	$p < .001$		ns	
White	(n=240)	95%	(n=203)	93%
Black	(n=39)	80%	(n=72)	88%

Table #3

Between Demographic Group Differences for Specific Retention of Political Advertising Within Atlanta and Philadelphia (Chi-Square Analysis and Percent Affirming Retention)

	Within Atlanta (N=281)	Within Philadelphia (N=276)
Education	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
8th grade of less	(n=29) 28%	(n=28) 4%
Some H.S.	(n=34) 26%	(n=67) 39%
Completed H.S.	(n=62) 64%	(n=86) 26%
Some College	(n=65) 66%	(n=49) 51%
Completed College	(n=84) 74%	(n=43) 72%
Socio-Economic Status	$p < .001$	$p < .02$
High-90+ on U.S. Gov't. Census Scale	(n=69) 75%	(n=25) 64%
Middle - 70-89	(n=109) 63%	(n=71) 59%
Low - 69 or less	(n=103) 41%	(n=177) 41%
Sex	ns	ns
Male	(n=126) 60%	(n=93) 44%
Female	(n=155) 56%	(n=182) 50%
Age	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
51+ yrs.	(n=56) 27%	(n=97) 31%
31-50 yrs.	(n=110) 58%	(n=95) 57%
30 or less yrs.	(n=104) 71%	(n=83) 55%
Race	$p < .01$	$p < .001$
White	(n=240) 62%	(n=202) 54%
Black	(n=39) 38%	(n=72) 29%

Table #4

Selective Retention of Political Advertising On the Basis of Candidate Preference In Seven Mass Media

	% Affirming Retention of Information for Preferred Candidate Only	
	McGovern Supporters (n=153)	Nixon Supporters (n=324)
Received in Mail	21%	10%
Seen in Posters	14%	4%
Seen in Magazines	12%	3%
Heard on Radio	10%	2%
Seen in Other Media	6%	4%
Seen in Newspapers	5%	3%
Seen on Television	3%	2%

Table #5

Selective Retention of Specific Political Advertising On the Basis of Candidate Preference (Chi-Square Analysis)

Candidate Preference	Number of People who Retain Advertising	Percentage who Retain at Least One Advertisement about McGovern	Percentage who Retain at Least one Advertisement about Nixon
McGovern	n=80	91%	68%
Nixon	n=181	68%	86%
Other/OK	n=33	94%	64%
		x^2=23.02, df=2, $p < .001$	x^2=15.38, df=2, $p < .001$